



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,104	07/11/2006	Karl Lubitz	071308.0736	6058
31625	7590	12/26/2008	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			NOLAND, THOMAS	
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			2856	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,104	Applicant(s) LUBITZ ET AL.
	Examiner Thomas P. Noland	Art Unit 2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 September 2008**.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-15** is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) **7,8 and 10** is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) **1-6, 9 and 11-15** is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

1. Applicant's election of the third species, reading on or not excluding claims 1-6, 9 and 11-15 in the reply filed on Sept. 24, 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. The restriction requirement is made final.

3. Claims 7-8 and 10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on Sept. 24, 2008.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomohiro et al (US 6,464,925 or US 6,521,166).
Tomohiro et al 6,464,925 in Fig. 3 and Tomohiro et al 6,521,166 in Fig. 2 discloses a method substantially as claimed except that the correlation appears to be done using

Art Unit: 2856

only one component. However it would have been obvious to have used multiple components since substantially identical components could be expected to produce substantially similar results and using multiple components would allow any slight variability in a given component to be averaged out in the correlation. Generally it is a known technique to correlate the effect of applying a condition to one component to another and to use this correlation to predict future behavior. The exact condition or correlation tested or applied would be dependent upon known or readily observable effects. Those claimed appear to be known to effect piezoelectric materials.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maruyama US 6,046,526, cited in the IDS.

Note col. 4, line 46-48 and col. 6, lines 61-62

8. Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Borchers et al US 2002/0173573, cited in the IDS.

Note paragraph 37.

Art Unit: 2856

9. Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Tomohiro et al US 6,464,925, cited in the IDS. Note Fig. 3 and col. 2, lines 9-18.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Ausserlechner et al discloses monitoring piezo effects on components.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Noland whose telephone number is (571) 272-2202. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Hezron E. Williams, can be reached on (571) 272-2208.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to 2800 Customer Service at (571) 272-2815.

**/Thomas P. Noland/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2856**

Dec. 21, 2008